

February 12, 1973

of land behind the children in the one school district than in another, is this not correct?

SENATOR GOODRICH: You are right.

SENATOR STAHMER: Alright, so when we tie in school site and buildings to what the value of what property is worth, are we not in fact saying that if a child is in a poor district he is going to end up with half as many square feet of building or half as many dollars to spend for buildings and land then if he lives in a rich district?

SENATOR GOODRICH: Unless they get some state aid equalization.

SENATOR STAHMER: That has nothing to do with it, this is under the building fund dilemma, and there is a four mill limitation. Papillion has a law suit right now on the general fund appropriations tied to property tax. I am seeking to add a petition to the court to call to the attention of the court that when in fact we tie building funds levies to value of land we allow rich districts to buy, have twice as much buying power and to build twice as many square foot of buildings per pupil as in a poor district. Would you not agree that this is the case?

SENATOR GOODRICH: I think I would have to agree with you Senator Stahmer.

SENATOR STAHMER: Thank you very much, I just want to call the attention the districts, that most of these suburban rich districts, they're going to be able to build and buy twice as much school land and build twice the buildings that the poorer districts are going to be able to do, and I certainly question whether this is going to be able to stand up in Federal court as now before the nation. In other words, in a word, I think our laws pegging the buying of land and building of buildings to the value of property is unconstitutional, if not by the state constitution then by the federal constitution.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Could I respond to that Mr. Chairman? I just want to call the body's attention to the fact that what Senator Stahmer is talking about relative to unfair treatment of school districts is not, does not really pertain to the motion that's under consideration right now, and it does not pertain to the merits of this particular bill insofar as this bill is concerned, there is nothing wrong with the constitutionality of this bill.

SENATOR STAHMER: A point of personal privilege, I beg to disagree with you. The wealthy districts have got twice as much money behind them without going out for bond issues to buy big sites, a poor district that also has great building needs, does not have this wealth behind it. It very much pertains, and your wealthy districts are going to be able to go out and buy those big sites that the poor districts can't.

SPEAKER: Senator Stahmer the Chair would like to point out that you can't use a point of personal privilege to discuss a bill. The Chair would now like to recognize Senator Kelley, then we have Senator Dickinson, then Senator Whitney. Senator Kelley. We also have another amendment on the desk, but we are still speaking right now at this point, Senator Kelley on the Dickinson amendment, that's all that is under discussion.

SENATOR KELLY: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to support the forty acres. That's approximately sixteen city blocks and I would say that we need four blocks for the school house, and four blocks for the athletic plant and four blocks for the parking lot and four blocks for the teachers lounge, and I think that comes out just right.

SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion of the amendment? The Chair recognizes, Senator Whitney did you wish to be heard on this amendment? The Chair recognizes Senator Whitney.